

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Reexamination of the captioned application is respectfully requested.

**A. SUMMARY OF THIS AMENDMENT**

By the current amendment, Applicants basically:

1. Amend claims 1, 6, 14-16, 22 and 23.
2. Respectfully traverse all prior art rejections.

**B. PATENTABILITY OF THE CLAIMS**

Claims 1-27 stand rejected under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent 6,856,612 to Bjelland. All prior art rejections are respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

Applicant's independent claims 1, 6, 14 and 22 require, e.g., the logical mapping of multimedia capabilities information to inband messages carried in a channel of an intermediate circuit switched network.

Paragraph 2 of the Detailed Action overlooks the prominent, repeated statements that Bjelland maps inband TFO on the circuit switched leg with an out-band negotiation clone over the IP leg. That the IP leg carries out-band message is amply evident from, e.g., col. 3, lines 50-55; col. 6, line 35, and col. 6, lines 57-58. Thus, Bjelland does not teach carrying of inband messages on the intermediate network.

Enumerated paragraph 3 of the Detailed Action states that the independent claims do "not limit the" inband messages to be carried over the IP network." This statement is confusing, not understood, and appears irrelevant. Applicant's independent claims do state that inband messages are carried on the circuit switched network (which is the

intermediate network). As stated above, Bjelland's intermediate IP network does not carry in-band messages.

Moreover, Bjelland's IP network is not a circuit-switched network. IP networks are packet switched, not circuit switched. Therefore, the conclusion of the Office Action that "the transfer of information between the two circuit networks via the IP network reads on "in band message" be carried in a channel of a circuit switch network" is utterly incorrect. Bjelland does not anticipate.

Various ones of Applicants' dependent claims have additional features of patentable merit, which need not be emphasized now in view of the manifest allowability of the independent claims. However, Applicants reserve the right to argue patentability of the dependent claims, as well as other features of the independent claims, should such become necessary in the future.

### **C. MISCELLANEOUS**

In view of the foregoing and other considerations, all claims are deemed in condition for allowance. A formal indication of allowability is earnestly solicited.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge the undersigned's deposit account #14-1140 in whatever amount is necessary for entry of these papers and the continued pendency of the captioned application.

Should the Examiner feel that an interview with the undersigned would facilitate allowance of this application, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned.

GRAF et al  
Serial No. 10/019,530

**Atty Dkt:** 4009-63  
**Art Unit:** 2663

Respectfully submitted,

**NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.**

By:                     /H. Warren Burnam, Jr./                      
H. Warren Burnam, Jr.  
Reg. No. 29,366

HWB:lsb  
901 North Glebe Road, 11th Floor  
Arlington, VA 22203  
Telephone: (703) 816-4000  
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100